DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 062 905 HE 002 953

AUTHOR	Pfnister, Allan O.
TITLE	The Evaluation of Overseas Study Programs: Two Case Studies (Central America and Spain).
INSTITUTION	Denver Univ., Colo. School of Education.
PUB DATE	[72]
NOTE	51p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Curriculum Evaluation; Foreign Countries; *Higher Education; *International Education; *Program Evaluation; *Student Exchange Programs; *Study Abroad; Summative Evaluation

ABSTRACT

Study abroad programs have, in the last few years, expanded to unprecedented proportions with over half of the American liberal arts colleges permitting their students to earn credit overseas. As large as the programs have become, however, relatively few, if any, evaluation procedures have taken place for these programs. This document describes 2 rather different approaches for the evaluation of overseas programs. The first summarizes the impressions of a 4-man commission requested by Goshen College (Indiana) to evaluate a unique foreign study program, the Study-Service Term. The other reviews the efforts of a group of study directors to establish some type of reporting and evaluation methods for American programs in Spain. The 2 approaches reflect the increasing concern for examining the quality of American overseas study experience. Continuing effort will be needed at both points. (HS)

THE EVALUATION OF OVERSEAS STUDY PROGRAMS:

TWO CASE STUDIES
(CENTRAL AMERICA AND SPAIN)

Allan O. Pfnister
Professor of Higher Education
School of Education, University of Denver

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Occasional Papers in Higher Education

Number 1

HE 002 953

In a recently published monograph Allan A. Michie observed that American study abroad, both academic year and summer, has "proliferated so rapidly in recent years that it has created the impression of an uncontrolled, uncoordinated and ill-prepared movement."[1] Various estimates are given about the number of American students studying abroad. The Institute for International Education publication "Open Doors" for 1969 reports well over 25,000 American students enrolled in foreign colleges and universities during 1967-68 and over 11,000 enrolled in special sessions, for the most part summer study programs. It is not at all clear how many colleges have programs underway, but Michie suggests that more than half of the American liberal arts colleges "permit their students to earn credit overseas."[2]

Study abroad takes on an incredible variety of forms. The "programs" range all the way from granting credit after the fact to permitting study only after screening students through an elaborate selection procedure for admission into well-established centers. Ben Euwema at one time offered a four-way classification of existing programs.[3] He referred to the four types as: (1) the branch campus program, (2) the half-way house, (3) complete integration, and (4) independent study programs.

---

[1]Allan A. Michie. Higher Education and World Affairs. New York: Education and World Affairs, 1968, p. 22.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ben Euwema. Undergraduates Overseas: A Look at U.S. Programs. New York: The Institute of International Education, 1966.

As difficult as classification is, even more of a problem is that of assessing the value of the study experiences. Michie comments that the quality of many of the programs is "under question," and he refers to the "haphazard growth" exhibited in the programs.[4] Edward Durnall visited 23 cities in which study abroad programs were located, interviewed students, and attempted to make some assessment of the quality of the programs. He observes that study abroad as a formal program has been in existence for more than 40 years and that basic principles for developing a worthwhile study abroad experience have been fairly well accepted, but he concludes that "many U.S. institutions have embarked upon such ventures without careful planning, administrative and faculty support, and continuing evaluation which are necessary to achieve academic excellence."[5] Weidner also comments that there has been surprisingly little in the way of "measurements of the results achieved through study abroad."[6] Abrams echoes the concern. While reporting on some of the research that has been undertaken, Abrams goes to say, "it is surprising how few researchers have tried to measure the impact of foreign study upon the American student."[7]

In the report that follows two rather different approaches to the evaluation of overseas study programs will be described. The

---

[4]Michie, op. cit., p. 22.

[5]Edward J. Durnall.. "Study-Abroad Programs: A Critical Survey," Journal of Higher Education, XXXVIII (November, 1967), p. 453.

[6]Edward W. Weidner. The World Role of Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1962, p. 109.

[7]Irwin Abrams. "The Study Abroad," Higher Education: Some Newer Developments. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1965, Chapter 4.

first summarizes the impressions of a four-man commission requested by Goshen College (Indiana) to evaluate a unique foreign study experience, the Study-Service Term. The other reviews the effort of a group of study directors to establish some type of reporting and evaluation of American programs in Spain, particularly those clustered around the University of Madrid. The two approaches reflect the increasing concern for examining the quality of American overseas study experience. The Goshen College study illustrates the effort of a single institution to assess a program. The work of the Conference Board shows the efforts of a number of individuals to establish a basis for reviewing a cluster of programs. Continuing effort will be needed at both points.

PART I. THE GOSHEN COLLEGE STUDY

One of the key issues emerging in the evaluation of the Goshen College program is that of determining how best to integrate the experiential and academic. At least this was the reaction of the four-man commission named by the College to evaluate the Study-Service Term, Goshen's approach to intercultural study.[8] By "experiential" the commission was referring to the field work, the day-to-day contact between the students and the people of the host country. By "academic" the commission was referring to the more traditional structure

---

[8]The team consisted of: Harold Epstein, vice-president, Institute of International Education, New York City; Henry Gleason, professor of linguistics, University of Ontario, Toronto; Lewis Hoskins, director of international education, Earlham College, Indiana (chairman); Allan Pfnister, professor of higher education, University of Denver, Colorado.

established for teaching and learning in the typical college setting--lectures, discussions, papers and examinations.

Goshen is a four-year, coeducational, liberal arts college enrolling somewhat over 1100 students and maintained under the auspices of the Mennonite Church. The College began a new academic program in the fall of 1968 organized around a trimester academic calendar. One of the features of the new program is a required term of study and service away from the campus and in another cultural setting.

The Study-Service Term, as it is called, consists of 14 weeks more or less equally divided between study and service in locations in Central America and the Caribbean. Groups of 15 to 25 students travel each term to Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras, Guadaloupe and Jamaica. A member of the Goshen faculty accompanies the group serving as professor, administrator, guide and programmer. Students engage in field service and in study assignments in the language and culture of the country in which they are located. During the first year over 280 students participated. The study service term comes normally during the sophomore year. Since the term is considered an integral part of the academic program, the expenses of the 14 weeks are met out of the regular on-campus student charges and fees.

The challenge to establish a clearer relation between the academic and the experiential is the same challenge students generally cast in the form of a demand for more relevance: How does what is happening in the classroom relate to the "real" world outside? This challenge is posed with particular force in overseas study programs. Such programs may too easily become an interlude--a semester or a year--between periods of on-campus academic study. Or, the foreign

study experiences may become little more than transplating a campus classroom to some other geographical location. In both instances study programs fail to capitalize on the unique potentials for combining the experiential and the academic--for being more relevant.

Goshen College is attempting to combine the two aspects by having the student devote seven of the 14 weeks to a clearly defined service project and 7 weeks to a more structured classroom-like experience with lectures, discussion, reading and reports. The student receives a trimester's credit, assigned by faculty decision to Humanities (3 hours), Social Science (3 hours), Natural Science (1 hour), Language (3 or more hours). In most cases the study portion comes during the first 7 weeks in the host country. During 1969-70 one unit in Costa Rica began with the service assignment.

In the study period, students typically attend lectures given in large part by nationals of the host country. The lectures are interspersed with short field trips to sites related to the lectures. Students are required to complete a special term project, which can range from an essay on social customs in the country to a report on family interrelationships or a comparative study of governmental structures. The Costa Rica unit listed 34 topics and 10 field trips for the study period in the autumn term, 1969. Lectures were on such topics as the government of Costa Rica, the Latin American family, Costa Rican musical production, painting and painters, industrial development, economic problems and progress, the press, literature, architecture, the Central American common market, the history of Costa Rica, stereotype attitudes of Latins toward the United States. Field trips took the students to the government quarters, to cultural

centers, to industries in San Jose, to an archaeological dig, to a plantation and to the city health services. The pattern was similar for the other units.

Students live with families while abroad. Indeed they live with two sets of families, one family during the study period in San Jose or Managua or Kingston and another family during the period of service. Service assignments vary in striking ways. In Nicaragua during the spring of 1970, two students were assisting in a community development project in a barrio on the edge of Esteli; a model community of sorts was emerging in the midst of extreme poverty. As the unit leader reported, one of the students was "teaching just about everything" and the other had "developed wonderful blisters on the palms of his hands, and is teaching rabbit and pig feeding." In the same unit another student was teaching Alfalit, another was teaching in a parochial school, a third was working with an agricultural extension division, two others were serving at the end of a six-hour boat trip up the river from Bluefields. In Costa Rica, the majority of the group for the year was involved in teaching English in schools, clubs and organizations or coaching teams and leading recreational groups. Child care in institutions, hospitals and care centers occupied another large group. A number were serving as orderlies and general assistants in hospitals. Two served as lab technicians in hospitals, others were in construction work of all types, painting, assisting in homes for the aged, cooking, sewing, cleaning.

The challenge in all of this is to combine the 14 weeks into a more or less unified experience, and in turn relate the 14 weeks

in Central America to the campus in Goshen, Indiana. To determine how well the College was succeeding was the assignment given to the four-man commission. The commission held its first meeting on the Goshen campus in July, 1969, at which time the general format for the evaluation was set. Meeting on campus later in the same year, commission members interviewed students, both those planning to join the next units leaving for the SST locations and those who had completed their terms. In the meantime the College was gathering reports from student SST participants and faculty, had administered a specially constructed values inventory, and was undertaking other special studies at the request of the commission.

During the spring and summer, 1970, members of the commission visited each of the sites, spending several days on location. The schedule was arranged in such a way that the commission, no member of which visited all of the sites, could nonetheless have at least two visitors at each site and could observe both the study and service portions of the program. The commission met as a group again on campus after the site visits to compare notes and to examine additional information gathered by the College. An additional meeting in the fall of 1970 produced the first draft of a study report, and the final report was presented to the College in November, 1970.

The general conclusion of the commission was quite positive. In the words of the report:

> The commission felt that most students derived great value from the SST experience. Fourteen weeks in another culture, combining language and academic studies with a field experience has, for almost all, been educationally rewarding and often the highlight of their college career. It is clear

> to the commission that the program is an imaginative one, thoughtfully designed and administered. It has rendered a signal contribution to the total educational enterprise of Goshen.... It is clear to the commission that the SST is a valuable <u>educational</u> one for most participants. It enriches the four-year liberal arts course. In some cases it contributes to directly to a major field; to others it is broadening interdisciplinary experience of value. It can be significant vocationally.[9]

What the commission found was a program which on balance must be judged quite 'successful." But because the observations of the commission about the Goshen SST program and its structure relate to many of the questions raised by any overseas study program, it is perhaps instructive to review the findings of the commission as a more general commentary on the state of the art--both in the operation of such programs and in their evaluation.[10]

Goshen College's attempt to provide both immediate and active involvement in the society with a degree of objectivity characterizing more formal study dramatically poses the issue of how best to combine the academic and the experiential. Based as it is to such a degree on field experience, on placing a student into immediate contact with the society, SST is forced to employ teaching and learning methods substantially different from those used in most courses

---

[9]"Evaluation of 'Study-Service Term' for Goshen College, 1970," Commission Report dated December 15, 1970, mimeographed, pp. 1-2.

[10]Evaluation of overseas study experiences, though limited, certainly is not a new phenomenon. Cf. C. Robert Pace, <u>The Junior Year in France</u>, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1959; John A. Garraty and Walter Adams, <u>From Main Street to the Left Bank</u>, East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1959; the June, 1962 and July, 1963 issues of <u>Journal of Social Issues</u>, Vol. 18 (June 1962), Vol. 19 (July 1963), particularly the latter; the bibliography of Irwin T. Sanders and Jennifer C. Ward, <u>Bridges to Understanding</u>, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

taught on campus. To do so has implications for the entire educational approach at Goshen. A term in Central America cannot be viewed as an isolated element, something inserted into the "normal" activities, a period of field experience injected into the four-year curriculum. But this is the way in which all too many junior year abroad or short-term overseas programs are generally viewed. Because relatively few students in any one institution participate in overseas study, most institutions are able to avoid facing questions about the fit between the study period and on-campus activity. Goshen is unable to avoid the issues. Other programs ought not avoid the issues.

The issue is pointed up because the design of SST both anticipates and encourages the comparison. While on-field the students must try to relate the field activity to the academic program. The combination of study and service forces a comparison. That the Goshen College staff was concerned during the planning for SST is revealed in the design of the program to combine both study and service. The planners did not want the 14 weeks to be so different from the campus activity as to concentrate wholly on 14 weeks of service, not did the planners want to make the study service term so much like the on-campus activity that it would mean little more than transplanting a Goshen classroom to San Jose or Kingston or Managua--hence study-service, study and service.

Several devices are being employed in an attempt to help students relate the academic and the experiential. Students are required to maintain journals. As might be expected, some journals record observations with a great deal of insight, while others are

completed in a perfunctory manner. How to make the journal less a diary of interesting experiences and more of a learning device is a challenge faced by each unit and unit leader. One leader meticulously reviews the journals week by week and raises pointed questions about observations made or missed. If the students take the criticism and comments seriously, they will go back and try to find out what they have missed and how they might improve their involvement and observation in the future. Reviewing the journal is time-consuming and yet to make keeping journals more than a perfunctory exercise requires such review.

The students are also required to prepare a research paper. But undertaking a research paper while in the field only points up the issue in another way. Students are at first prepared to approach such an assignment as they would back in Goshen, Indiana. They read, take notes, combine the notes in some more or less orderly manner, and then attempt to reach some conclusions about the topic being studied. But in most of the sites in which the students are working, the usual resource, a good library with books in English is lacking. Faced with this situation the students bent on following standard procedures are either frustrated or compromise on a less well-prepared paper with few or no references.

A better answer to student frustration--and a better learning experience--is to make the assignment of a research paper into a different kind of project. Where SST students had great difficulty with research assignments because of a lack of secondary material in a good library, they revealed that they have been trained to write papers almost exclusively on the basis of library material.

They do not know adequately how to gather and use primary data. Why not in courses on campus where appropriate encourage students to gather and use primary data? Then, in the SST period it would be possible to emphasize systematic observation and reflection as source material.

Students also need opportunity to employ the field approach on return to the home campus. While the pedagogical principle that practice and reinforcement help to establish skills is generally recognized, all too few college faculty are prepared to capitalize on the interest and excitement aroused by off-campus experiences; it is back to books and secondary sources and standard operating procedures. The Goshen SST experience, however, makes it difficult to continue in standard form; and students at Goshen will be given more opportunity for more flexible approaches to on-campus study--if Goshen exploits the possibilities opened by the SST experience.

All of which leads to a repetition of the generalization that if study abroad programs are to contribute more concretely to the total educational experience, more conscious effort must be given to building study abroad into the ongoing campus program. There must be much more interaction than is typically found. For Goshen College SST appears to be forcing decisions and realignments that colleges with less ambitious programs find possible to avoid.

The commission recommended, and the college is seeking to implement more fully the recommendation, that more preparation in field study and observation be given before the study-service term and experiences during the term be consciously related to

the campus work after return. The commission urged more effort toward effective use of returning students from SST in seminars as well as in regular classroom sessions. Returning students are potentially significant resource persons for the entire educational program.

One of the complaints of students who have participated in the junior year abroad or some other experience is that although they return to the campus excited about the experiences they have had, they find it almost impossible to communicate these experiences to students on campus who have not shared similar experiences. Indeed they find a certain resistance from their fellows, students and faculty, to their recounting their overseas experiences. After several rebuffs they cease trying to communicate to others, and in time the experience itself fades into the background as a pleasant memory. Charles Hammel, a graduate student at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, reported in the spring 1970 issue of Vidya on his experiences in a junior year abroad program at Basil, Switzerland:

> The personal nature of the year of study became painfully obvious to me with the discovery that few people at home were really interested in anything beyond the traditional, superficial questions usually asked of the tourist. After having been away for a year--stimulated by the new ideas of new friends--it was disconcerting to find apathy on the part of those you have not seen for a long period.[11]

He goes on to say that this response caused him to ask whether the junior year was worth all of the effort:

---

[11]Charles Hammel. "A Student Abroad Returns: Problems and Suggestions," Vidya (Spring, 1970), p. 30.

> To then return to college as a senior and to find oneself on the outside of university activities looking in was a further frustration. The student who has developed new interests while abroad may find himself just as uninterested in university activities as his friends in what he has done during the past year.... A senior back from foreign study seeks communication and tolerance as he did while abroad. But, because of the intengible nature of his process of discovery, it becomes difficult to relate back to the American scene.... Having lived with total strangers for nine months, sometimes under difficult circumstances, we wondered how the world had failed to live in peace. Similarly it is difficult to understand how the fellow nextdoor in the dorm could fail to understand the tremendous, personal, intangible discoveries we as international students made abroad.[12]

Hammel's experience is the rule rather than the exception. The Goshen student, however, potentially finds himself in a different situation. He can share his experiences with literally hundreds of others who have had similar if not identical experiences. The opportunity is open to capitalize upon what he has learned, to continue to build upon those experiences. Yet, even at Goshen conscious effort is required to incorporate the foreign study experiences into the on-campus program, for even with the built-in sources of reinforcement, the SST experience can fade into the background as a pleasant interlude.

The field experience, whether termed "work," "service," "field study,"--and the commission preferred the term "field experience"--is a unique feature of the Goshen program. It appeared to the commission that the separation of the 14 weeks into two more or less discrete pieces, "service " and "study," while convenient in terms of administration, appeared less than

---

[12]Ibid., pp. 30-31.

adequate pedagogically. Could not the 14 weeks be viewed as a single, integrated educational experience rather than as two distinct 7 week blocks? Possibly for administrative convenience Goshen will have to continue to maintain the two divisions. There are problems of housing, of establishing jobs, of working with host families, and a score of other administrative constraints. Yet insofar as possible the emphasis of the two segments of time should be brought together in a common focus. In terms of establishing closer fit between the academic and the experiential, the field experience is integral to the campus and the campus is integral to the field experience.

Among the suggestions made by the commission is that if field experience and study period are viewed as integral, there are at least the following implications: (a) the carefully chosen lectures during the "study" period need to be interspersed with guided observation, field work, interpretation, and, of course, reading; (b) any written paper should stress direct observation and assessment rather than library 'resources'--better library work can probably be done on the Goshen campus, but direct observation of Central American culture is impossible in Goshen, Indiana; (c) the emphasis is needed on conscious reflections and discussion about what one has seen and experienced--this reflection is needed not only during the SST experience but on the Goshen campus as well.

-0-

The commission went on to examine in more depth the concept of "service" in SST. At first members of the commission were

skeptical of this aspect. They frankly doubted that the emphasis should be upon providing service; as has already been indicated, the commission came to prefer the term "field experience." There was no question in the minds of the commission members that the field experience is a critical part of the program. Even during the first SST trimester, the field experience emerged as the most significant in the minds of the students. It provided a touch of reality to discussions about different cultures, different ways of life, different patterns of value. But whether this experience is cast into the form of "service" remains an open question. The commission noted that the ideal of making a contribution to host countries is laudable. But it is difficult for anyone, no less an undergraduate, to make a significant contribution during a short period in most foreign countries where the level of manpower is usually in abundant supply. And it was clear that perceptive students among the Goshen College group were keenly aware of their inadequacies and recognized that some of the jobs were "made work."

Rapid social change is unlikely in most of the areas in which the SST program is now involved. Outsiders have little opportunity to facilitate reform even if they were able to define the needs more clearly. There is not enough time to contribute in any continuous way. Nonetheless, the commission did find that a number of useful tasks had been carried out and it encouraged the College to continue efforts to make the program reciprocal by finding ways to make more substantial contributions to the host country and to the people. While the possibility of rendering substantial service is remote, and while any one project is not

likely to result in permanent changes, the constant effort to find ways in which to make contributions to the host country will keep the relationship a mutually rewarding one.

The relation with the host country and/or institution is one that needs further exploration in all overseas study programs. A fair number of the American study programs overseas have been established with relatively little concern about the impact the program might have upon the host. European study programs especially have been established with less than adequate concern about the higher education situation in the country. Many European universities are already overcrowded. Students are demanding more services and attention. An American program that attempts to utilize fully the resources of the university only places an additional burden on an already overburdened institution. In some instances the presence of American students in lecture means that other students are unable to attend. While American institutions are showing greater awareness of the problems created by American programs, for too long a time Americans have not been sufficiently sensitive to their impact or their responsibilities to the host country. A great deal more needs to be done. The Goshen program, by way of contrast, places service to the host country high on the priorities.

Members of the study commission were of the opinion that reassessment of the service aspect would not do violence to the basic intent of the program. It is possible to engage in a field experience, to make some contributions, to receive much in return, and maintain a vital program without trying to transform another

culture. To recognize the difficulty of engaging in service is not to take away from the intent. One of the interesting by-products of the emphasis upon service may have been that students were brought to realize that significant changes are not effected through short-term efforts. Students, at first disappointed because after living 7 or 8 weeks in a small village they were not able to see any great change in the pattern of living, began to realize that significant social change requires long and sustained effort. Even more important, they may have come to realize that their own ideas regarding service needed revision. That is to say, what they viewed as improvements or additions or positive change may not in the light of the needs of the people with whom they are working have been the most desirable changes.

-0-

The question of how to establish and maintain academic standards for overseas study academic standards is frequently raised. In assessing the Goshen SST program the commission pointed out that it was necessary to redefine the meaning of rigor and standards. The commission encouraged Goshen to examine the demand for "equivalent" academic standards during the field experience in the light of the different kinds of opportunities available during the field experience. That is to say, the particular activities related to "academic standards" on campus are not necessarily the kinds of activities appropriate to the on-site involvement in the new culture. Yet there is ample opportunity for no less rigorous intellectual effort during the SST experience. Written and oral work should continue to meet the highest academic levels, but it must always be kept in mind that this work should be enriched by the practical project experience.

The concept in the Goshen SST program of total involvement raises another issue. It is a general assumption that all students will participate, except for a few who arrange for a campus-based "international program" as a satisfactory alternative. The commission expressed serious doubts whether all students, in fact, should be expected to participate in a strongly cross-cultural program. It suggested that if Goshen College decides that all students should participate, then it recommends one or more less demanding cross-cultural experiences, either in the United States or Canada, which might be designed for those relatively few students for whom the foreign experience would be too demanding, involve health risks, or psychological damage.

On the other hand, one of the values of the Goshen program is that virtually all of the students <u>are</u> involved. This is a plus factor in that it helps to establish on the campus a mutually supporting environment both pre- and post-SST. Yet, all students are not prepared for the kind of cultural shock that attends most of the unit assignments.

The basic issue is perhaps less that of whether all students should be involved in a form of SST than one of selection-placement. Presently selection is based upon application during the term immediately preceeding the anticipated involvement in SST. Students indicate the regions to which they would like to go. In the light of their language facility and other considerations, an effort is made to place students in situations that are likely to benefit them. If, however, selection could occur at least a term before the student leaves campus, a more careful and adequate placement process might be possible. This would also give more time for orientation to the specific region the student will go.

Whether more elaborate testing and assessment devices could be employed to "match" students to the situation is a moot point. Unit leaders have observed that students who were apparently shy and retiring on campus sometimes emerge as leaders and stabilizing influences on site. And there are occasions when campus leaders prove to be singularly ineffective on site. The best approach is probably a combination of judgments from faculty members on campus, together with such counseling materials as are normally developed for each student on admission to college. The area of selection and placement is one that needs a great deal more examination in all overseas study programs.

-0-

What kind of orientation should students have before arriving at the study site? This is one of the more vexing questions for any overseas study program. On one hand, it may be argued that pre-departure briefing should be as thorough as possible. The student should know beforehand something about the culture of the country, should have some language training, and should have some conditioning to prepare him for the cultural differences he will face. Only through such preparation will he be prepared to gain the most benefit from his period in the country.

On the other hand, it is said that one of the most important aspects of the overseas study experience is the "culture shock." One cannot be introduced to a new culture through such artificial means as lectures and textbooks. He must become a part of the culture, and the socner the better. Lectures and readings before the arrival in the new country are academic in the most pejorative sense.

The study commission did not reach any new insights on the orientation problem. It was only convinced that more experimentation should be made to find more effective patterns. To arrive in the new country without any previous thought may be to face too much of a shock; the period of time spent in adjusting to the new culture may detract from the time that ought to be spent in learning about the culture firsthand. Yet the commission found that many students with minimal preparation were able to adjust fairly rapidly, that they related to their "families" quickly and were beginning to appreciate the new elements in the culture. But there were also students who after a period of several weeks were still relatively lost, who were still not gaining the full benefits of the experience.

Preparation for the SST experience varied all the way from an informal meeting at the home of the unit leader shortly before the group embarked for the site, to an attempt at a more or less systematic series of discussions of what might be found in the culture. The commission suggested that in some way pre-departure plans could include interpretation of the practices of SST; the nature of and expectations for the experience abroad; geographical, historical and cultural knowledge of the specific area, including an attempt at an explanation of the social mores; additional work in linguistics and language skills; and training in techniques of field observation and analysis.

One component in the pre-departure orientation that will probably not initially meet with student appreciation is the commission's recommendation that SSTers have a review of American history and contemporary American social issues. Their SST hosts invariably

expect American students to be acquainted with political and social developments at home and to be able to discuss these developments with some degree of authority. Hosts are prepared to discuss their own country in relation to happenings on the American scene and expect the students to be able to provide more in-depth information about the American scene. Most of the students find themselves embarassed by lack of knowledge of current events in America.

The commission observed that some of the pre-departure orientation training will occur in discussion with returned alumni, both students and faculty. The commission also recommended that the family of the unit leader be involved in any orientation program to the extent feasible. On site, not only the unit leader but the family of the unit leader become important elements in the experience of the student.

Of one thing the commission was reasonably sure and that was that the orientation program, however it is developed, will not be very successful as a "crash course." The orientation should better be seen as part of a long term effort at preparation for new challenges and new ways of assessing experiences. The long term effort may be intensified during the term preceding departure, but ought not to depend entirely upon a few sessions immediately before departure. The key is probably to achieve a balance between providing that kind of training that anticipates every problem on the field and that which leaves the situation open enough for a degree of shock and impact. Astronauts need to be trained for months in anticipation of almost every eventuality. The unexpected can be fatal. But while the unexpected in the student overseas experience can have serious consequences, the unexpected is also the basis for learning. To have

to confront and solve problems is also to learn more about the situation itself. Part of liberal education is developing the generalized skills to meet a variety of circumstances.

-0-

Another one of the perennial issues relating to foreign study is that of the amount of language training a student should have prior to embarking. The commission found the students in the non-English speaking units to be of very diverse ability. A good number came with so little French or Spanish that even after their on-site language training they were still unable to communicate effectively. Others, while lacking polish, seemed able to communicate remarkably well.

While the focus of the SST is not upon language training as such, the commission recommended consideration of proposing a modest but firm language requirement for admission to SST units using French or Spanish. At least one semester of the language or its equivalent within a year before departure would seem a modest enough requirement. This semester of study, however, probably should be something other than what we have come to understand as a traditional program. Emphasis "simply" on conversation is not always greeted with enthusiasm by foreign language departments. Yet, if the efforts could be devoted toward building the basic competence needed for communication, language departments might be able to sharpen motivation considerably. For a student who has achieved basic ability before leaving the campus, on arriving at the site and finding that such ability enhances the experience, he should be encouraged to pursue additional study of the language. Goshen through the SST program has an opportunity for experimentation in language learning if it is able to coordinate on-campus teaching and learning with the SST experience.

Just what is the minimal pre-departure level for effective utilization of a "home" experience in a foreign area? What should be the balance among grammar, composition, reading, and conversation techniques? What does language competence level say to field priorities and their sequence? What are the competencies of a non-expert? Study abroad programs can go to the extremes. There are those that require no acquaintance with the language whatsoever. Others require competencies that can be gained from only several years of study. Proponents of the latter position tend to make language competency one of the main outcomes of the study experience. But, while language competency is important to the experience, should it be made the sole purpose of the experience?

-0-

Still another issue considered by the commission was the matter of leadership. Goshen is committed to involving virtually every faculty member as a supervisor in an SST assignment. With a relatively small faculty, this goal may not be wholly realistic. Not every faculty member may be qualified or interested in a foreign assignment. The demands upon a unit leader are heavy. He must supervise students academically, must oversee work projects, and must spend many hours as a personal counselor. He is a diplomat, linguist, administrator, academic consultant, and student personnel dean. He must be sensitive to the stresses and strains under which the students are living. He must be adaptable, developing new study and work experiences as required.

The commission stated its conviction that no little part of the success of a study abroad program depends upon the effectiveness

of the leadership. While there may be considerable difference of opinion about the orientation appropriate for students prior to departure there seems to be little question that the unit director needs pre-departure orientation. He certainly needs language training, a thorough introduction to the culture of the site, and an understanding of the demands of the field. The commission suggested several models for training. Under one model a prospective unit leader would spend one term in the program as an assistant or understudy to a resident director. During that time he could develop his language competence and could become better acquainted with the on-site situations that are so difficult to describe back on campus. Following his term as assistant. he could return to the campus to assist in the orientation of his unit, then accompany the group to the field. He would be able to contribute both to the on-campus orientation and would be able to move directly into his assignment.

Another model would bring the prospective unit leader into the field for several terms under a more established supervisor before he actually takes over responsibility himself. This approach would enable a continuity in the program that in the long-term would seem to repay the added expenses of training him.

-0-

The commission also considered the matter of locations for study abroad programs. It observed that Goshen's decision to establish SST in Central America carried both significant advantages and disadvantages. The advantages would seem to grow out of increased potential for experiencing culture shock. In Central America students are required to come to terms with cultures rather different from mid-western

America; they are thus forced to examine their own values and commitments. At the same time, there are disadvantages in the self-same conditions. Because the culture is different--although there are deceptive resemblances to North American culture--more effort is required to derive the greatest value from the experience.

For example, a student can land at Orly, take a bus to Paris, pick up a map and guidebook, and in short order find his way to the historic sites and museums. He has a sense of familiarity through his study of European history and through having viewed pictures of, and through having read about, Paris. He finds himself reasonably at home in the Louvre. The other landmarks are much as he imagined them to be. But, Managua, San Jose, Kingston, these are but names. And to most Americans they are, unfortunately, associated with amusement and winter resorts. A student does not normally know much of the history of Latin American countries. He does not have guidebooks or maps that mean anything to him. And when he tries to become instructed and inspired by what he sees, hears, and does, instead of cultural continuity he finds discontinuity. During his 14 weeks in the Caribbean he may need more direction than he would need during 14 weeks in Paris or London. The task of understanding San Jose is vastly greater than that of understanding Paris. The challenge is of a different order. At the same time, the rewards can be great, especially is these experiences become an integral part of the total liberal arts experience.

The commission commended Goshen College on its selection of the Caribbean sites. But it pointed out that much effort is required to secure the benefits potentially available in the experience.

On balance, the story of SST is a success story. The College is now reviewing the report, has assigned as topics for study parts of the report to various faculty committees. The College continues to develop its own on-campus evaluation program. It has already begun to make some generalizations on the basis of responses on the values inventory. It is preparing other instruments. What is particularly noteworthy is that Goshen began the program with the intent of keeping it under constant scrutiny. While committed to SST, Goshen is still prepared to raise questions about the particular values of the program, to reassess procedures, and to change, if need be, in significant ways the approaches now being used. Over the years as Goshen amasses more experience and develops more data, it should be able to contribute in significant ways to the understanding of how foreign study experiences can be most effectively built into the curriculum. Under consideration at the present time is an in-depth study of the impact upon a selected group of students.

-0-

The Associated Colleges of the Midwest have been operating a program of undergraduate field research training in Central America since 1964. During the same year that the commission was studying the Goshen College program, six faculty members and 30 students were involved in three research projects in Costa Rica. The ACM program represents a rather different approach to field experience. It is devoted primarily to research activity within disciplines. Students participate in planning the research, determining the methodology, collecting the data, carrying on the study, and analyzing and assisting in writing a report. In one sense ACM is moving the campus experience

to another location because the data are to be found there. Yet there are elements in that research program that may parallel the efforts at achieving general cultural impact made by Goshen College. The ACM Central America research program involves only a few students from each of several campuses. This program is mentioned because it points to another effort at self-conscious evaluation of the impact of and the possible uses to which overseas experience can be placed.[13]

---

[13]For an evaluation of the ACM program, cf. Robert F. Voertman, "Undergraduate Research: Aid to Educational Relevance," The Educational Record, LI (Winter, 1970).

PART II: THE REGIONAL CONFERENCE BOARD OF AMERICAN PROGRAMS IN SPAIN

The Goshen College project illustrates one facet of the evaluation of study abroad programs, the effort of a single institution to assess on a continuing basis the impact of foreign study experience on its students. There is great need for such assessment among institutions sponsoring study abroad, whatever the form the program takes, and many different approaches to evaluation should be attempted. Evaluation of study abroad is also needed on a broader scale, on a scale that involves the type of review called for in general accreditation. Durnall concludes his report on visits to 23 cities in which American study abroad programs were located with the observation:

> While it would be hoped that all institutions with study-abroad programs would voluntarily examine their programs in the light of commonly accepted standards and either make the necessary improvements to meet these standards or discontinue the programs, the realities of higher education today make this an unlikely event. It is therefore recommended that the representatives of the several regional accrediting agencies, or some designated committee acceptable to all national accrediting agencies, formulate evaluative criteria for study abroad programs. Visitation committees should be constituted to visit the centers conducted by United States institutions, and their programs, staff, faculty, facilities, and students examined in the light of the criteria. Such visitation committees, while recognizing the uniqueness of study abroad, should nevertheless insist that the foreign programs meet standards comparable to those required for accreditation in the United States. It may have been possible in the past for the small number of institutions conducting study-abroad programs to practice a type of self-regulation, but the growing number and the diversity of types of institutions inaugurating such programs today makes this self-regulation impossible.[14]

---

[14]Durnall, op. cit., p. 453.

Before reviewing Durnall's recommendations, the writer had arrived at the same conclusion quite independently on the basis of discussions at a meeting of the Council on International Educational Exchange in the fall of 1969 and participation in The Fourth Conference on American Academic Programs in Europe, Palma de Majorca, Spain in January, 1970.[15] These meetings were followed by a return visit to Madrid in September 1970 to review the developments in the Regional Conference Board of American Programs in Spain.[16]

The way in which the Regional Conference Board of American Programs in Spain developed calls attention in a dramatic way to a growing concern that American regional accrediting agencies should in some manner become involved in evaluating collegiate study abroad programs. The Conference Board is the response of a group of directors

---

[15]Cf. Allan O. Pfnister, "Evaluation of Undergraduate Programs: In What Way Should Evaluation of Overseas Study Programs be Included in the Accreditation Process for Colleges and Universities" (Paper delivered at annual membership conference of the Council on International Educational Exchange, Tarrytown, New York, November 21, 1969), Occasional Papers on Undergraduate Study Abroad, Publication No. 15, New York: Council on International Educational Exchange, 1970; also "Improving the Educational Quality of Study Abroad Programs: Can Standards Be Established?" (Paper delivered at Fourth Conference on American Academic Programs in Europe, Palma de Majorca, Spain, January 27, 1970), Occasional Papers on Undergraduate Study Abroad, Publication No. 16, New York: Council on International Educational Exchange, 1970.

[16]The writer had also previously served on the Board of Directors of the Council on International Educational Exchange, the Board of Directors of the Regional Council on International Education, and as a member of the Dean's Advisory Committee of the Council on World Affairs. As Dean and subsequently as Provost of Wittenberg University (Ohio) he participated in the launching of study abroad programs in Japan, England, Mexico and a cooperative program in Basil, Switzerland.

of American programs in Spain to this concern. The study directors propose through a joint venture to review and evaluate a large proportion of the American collegiate programs in Spain.

The impetus for the establishment of the Conference Board came out of a conference called in January, 1968 by the Institute of Hispanic Culture in Madrid. The Institute arranged for a conference of directors of American programs in Spain in Puerto de la Cruz, Tenerife, to facilitate the exchange of information on current activities, problems, and solutions. The conference included also a representative from the Cultural Affairs Office of the Embassy of the United States, representatives from the Institute and from the Spanish universities. One of the outcomes of the meeting was the appointment of several committees charged to explore further certain problem areas which had been identified during the conference.

The Institute of Hispanic Culture in Madrid was established in 1946. It is an autonomous organization, supported by its own earnings and subventions from the ministries of Spanish foreign affairs and education. The Institute states as its principal aims:

> the study, defense and diffusion of Hispanic culture, the promotion of mutual understanding between Hispanic peoples, the continued contribution of cultural exchange and encouragement and coordination of all public initiative dedicated to these same ends.[17]

The Institute has sponsored conferences and special courses, has developed a publication series, and undertakes a number of other activities in the furtherance of these aims. Since 1950, the United States Department has assisted in the establishment in the Arts Faculty

---

[17]"The Institute of Hispanic Culture in Madrid." (Brochure describing the work of the Institute), 1969, p. 5.

of the University of Madrid of a number of North American university study abroad programs.[18] One of the first American academic year programs established at the University was that of New York University in 1955. Since then the Institute has worked in some way with most of the existing academic year and summer programs of American universities.

In February 1969, under the auspices of the Institute, the American study directors met again to review developments growing out of the previous year's meetings. A committee memorandum called attention to the "proliferation of American foreign programs in Spain, not in regard to numbers but in regard to low quality which jeopardizes our standing at home, and in the eyes of the Spanish universities."[19] The memorandum observed that there was a lack of standards for evaluation of study abroad programs, that in the eyes of some of the study directors a number of the existing programs seemed to be less than adequate and that some approach should be taken to define criteria for acceptability. The committee recommended the development of a "system of self-imposed evaluation and discipline which will indicate approval of the majority of substantial programs, which will offer creditable work, and to withhold approval from those who do not."[20] The memorandum called for the establishment of some form of evaluation and accreditation, "the institution of a Conference Board for Spain,

---

[18]Ibid., p. 39.

[19]"Memorandum on the Conference of American Programs submitted by the Committee to the Conference of American Programs in Spain," February, 1969.

[20]Ibid.

a local, regional organization to develop committees, statement, and criteria for evaluations."[21]

The committee of program directors had identified a problem, namely the apparent lack of quality control among overseas programs. In the absence of any other form of on-site evaluation on the part of any American agency, the committee was proposing that the study directors themselves form an organization that would be able to develop criteria and apply them to existing programs. While it became clear at a later date that the proposed organization would less likely assume an accrediting function as such, the early discussions seemed to imply that a structure similar to regional accreditation in the United States might be developed for the review and certification of programs abroad. Regional boards concerned with the problems of overseas study in a particular geographical region, in this case Spain, would establish procedures which could either be related to procedures of other accrediting organizations or carried on under the auspices of those other organizations.

The next step in the evolution of the Conference Board was to hold another invitational meeting to consider in more detail specific recommendations for the development of a new organization. Invitations were issued in March 1969 to directors of all known American study programs in Spain. The group convened at the Institute of Hispanic Culture in Madrid on April 18, 1969. Twenty study programs were represented at the meeting, and it was subsequently agreed that these programs would constitute the founding membership of the Conference

---

[21]Ibid.

Board. Before becoming founding members they were to indicate formal acceptance of the "Criteria for Accreditation," and the "Organizational Plan for the Regional Conference" by remitting a membership fee by May 31, 1969. The major outcomes of the April meeting were the preliminary adoption of the "Criteria for Accreditation" and the "Organizational Plan for the Regional Conference," the appointment of a temporary executive committee, and the development of plans for relating to other programs not represented at the organizational meeting.

Mr. Suarez de Puga, general secretary of the Institute of Hispanic Culture, later pointed out that at the meeting the Institute clearly indicated that it was serving as a facilitating agency to bring the group together but could not be directly involved in establishing policies or procedures. He indicated that the Institute would provide whatever assistance might be needed for the Board to develop its program, but that the internal policies of the Board and its procedures would have to be the responsibility of the Board itself.[22]

The Statement of Purpose adopted by what had by then become the "Regional Conference Board of American Programs in Spain" grew out of the February 1969 memorandum. The statement called for the "establishment of the same or similar safeguards of academic worth or validity in Spain which exist in the United States. In brief, we need evaluation, and the evaluation should lead to some form of regional accreditation."[23]

---

[22]Statement of Mr. Suarez de Puga in a "Memorandum to the Directors of American Academic Programs in Europe Meeting at Palma de Majorca January 26-29, 1970."

[23]Statement of Purpose, The Regional Conference Board of American Programs in Spain, April, 1969.

The "Organizational Plan of the Regional Conference Board of American Programs in Spain" called for the establishment of a Conference Board, executive committee, secretariat, and advisory committee. The Conference Board was defined to consist of the university level of American programs in Spain, of which the programs represented at the organizational meeting were recognized as original members. Other programs would be admitted to the Board on the basis of application and approval by the executive committee. Among the functions of the Conference Board were included "admission and exclusion of member programs," and the "establishment of criteria for accreditation." It was the intention of the Conference Board also "to publish lists of accredited programs and give them the widest possible circulation."[24]

The Executive Committee of the Conference Board contained representatives both of program directors in Spain and former program directors, six persons currently serving as program directors in Spain and three of the former directors residing in the United States. The executive committee was given responsibility for recommending "admissions or expulsion of programs from the Conference," and was charged to "implement the criteria for accreditation and propose amendments to the existing ones." The executive committee would also "maintain contact with other American accreditation and professional organizations."[25]

The plan of organization went on to develop procedures whereby program review would be undertaken, new programs included, programs dropped from the list, and procedures for appeal. All of this was in

---

[24]The Regional Conference Board of American Programs in Spain, Organizational Plan.

[25]Ibid.

keeping with the primary function of the Regional Conference "to establish means of evaluation and accreditation of American programs in Spain."[26]

The proposed criteria for evaluating programs include reference to the need for and qualifications of a resident program director, the nature of the academic program, the way in which the academic program maintains university level instruction--qualifications of teaching staff, nature of courses, transcripts, etc., reference to grading, admissions requirements, and class size. The criteria also noted that members of the Regional Conference Board should be prepared to agree "to periodic evaluation by a committee elected from the Board, and should make academic and personnel records available to the committee."[27]

While subsequently the Conference Board de-emphasized accreditation as such, it seems rather clear that during the early stages of development it did view its role as that of an accreditation agency. A letter of the chairman pro-tem of the Conference Board executive committee to one of the regional associations pointed up the need of regional accreditation specifically designed for overseas programs and expressed the hope that the "Regional Conference Board will be able to coordinate the efforts of American colleges and universities offering programs of study abroad and to help preserve the quality which the American system demands."[28] An earlier letter on behalf of the executive committee of the Conference Board to study directors in Spain invited

---

[26]Ibid.

[27]"Proposed Criteria for Program Acceptance into the Regional Conference Board of American Programs in Spain."

[28]Letter of Edward E. Settgast to Dr. Norman Burns, Executive Director of the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education, May 14, 1969.

their programs to participate in the work of the study board, calling attention to the plan for developing formal evaluation procedures after an October meeting of the Conference Board. The letter concluded with the statement that these procedures "will then be applied to all programs seeking accreditation through this body."[29]

In the course of the next meeting of the Conference, held in October, 1969, some revisions were made in the criteria as well as in the general organizational structure. The meeting included observers from the cultural section of the United States Embassy and of the Institute of Hispanic Culture in Madrid. The structure of the organization was formalized, an executive committee was elected, and plans were made for proceeding with evaluation. At that meeting it was noted that "special attention was given to the fact that regional accrediting agencies are not sufficiently familiar with foreign universities and American programs abroad to be able to examine such programs and present an evaluatory judgment such as that provided for in the terms of the American Conference Board."[30] Reference was made to the fact that the Board would be corresponding with the regional accrediting agencies in the United States through the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education as well as through individual agencies. The Board would also try to keep in touch with the professional language associations in the United States.

It is not the purpose of this report to debate the extent to which the Conference Board viewed itself as an accrediting agency during

---

[29]Letter to American study directors by James R. Stamm, April 30, 1969.

[30]Statement of Mr. Suarez de Puga, op. cit.

the early months of its development or to question whether the Conference Board should have viewed itself as an accrediting agency. The essential point is that in the view of at least 20 of the directors of American study programs in Spain, evaluation of study abroad programs was important enough to merit the development of a new organization. Both out of concern for the integrity for their own programs and out of convictions that some of the programs being established lacked sufficient concern for quality, the directors responsible proceeded to establish an organization that would help to clarify matters. At least to those directors, while presumably the American sponsoring institutions were aware of the development in their programs and concerned with the maintenance of quality, as a matter of record some of the study abroad programs did not maintain the quality that should have been expected at the home institution. The study directors were echoing the concerns of Durnall, when he stated that in spite of the fact that one might have expected that study abroad programs would "voluntarily examine their programs in the light of commonly accepted standards," the fact of the matter was that such was not happening and some additional means was needed to maintain quality.[31]

The efforts of the Conference Board in Spain did not receive universal approval. The developments were discussed at length at the annual membership meeting of the Council on International Educational Exchange in November, 1969. This organization grew out of the Council on Student Travel established in 1947-48. The Council has sponsored a number of seminars in various parts of the United States "for the

---

[31]Edward J. Durnall, op. cit., p. 453.

specific purpose of raising standards in the operation of overseas study programs."[32] Heavily involved in facilitating travel for students in overseas study programs through the first decades of its existence, the Council has in recent years itself become the sponsor of study programs abroad in the USSR for College Graduates and in Europe, Asia and Latin America for undergraduates and graduates in teacher education.

At the CIEE annual membership meeting several of the sessions turned to the problem of academic accreditation of American overseas study programs. The Council membership adopted a statement calling for the evaluation of overseas study. The statement asked that

1. The Council affirm the need for appropriate accrediting bodies to review current practices in granting of academic credit for overseas study.
2. The Council take action to recommend to the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions for Higher Education that they study recent developments in Spain regarding the accreditation of American study programs in Spain.
3. The Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education be extended an invitation to participate in discussions of the conference in Palma de Majorca.
4. The Council's member institutions be asked to request their representatives in Spain to hold in abeyance further action on the plans for the Conference Board until after discussions on accreditation at the Majorca Conference.[33]

During the Fourth Conference on American Academic Programs at Palma de Majorca accreditation of study abroad programs became the issue during at least three sessions. The meetings at Palma included representatives from study programs throughout Europe. Questions were raised about: (1) whether it was appropriate for an independent group

---

[32] A Guide to Institutional Self-Study and Evaluation of Educational Programs Abroad, New York: Council on Student Travel, Inc., 1965, p. 3.

[33] Minutes of business session, annual membership meeting of Council on International Educational Exchange, Tarrytown, N.Y., November 22, 1969.

of study directors to establish what appeared to be another set of accrediting procedures; (2) whether the American sponsoring institutions had been sufficiently involved in discussions leading to the establishment of the Conference Board, i.e., whether other than resident study directors had been consulted; (3) how regional accrediting agencies might be involved in further discussion. The consensus of the discussions appeared to be that the proper control of overseas study programs should be through regional accrediting agencies in the course of membership review of individual colleges and universities. It was pointed out, however, that on the basis of the present structure, the regional agencies might be able to do little more than call attention in passing to organization and structure of overseas study as in terms of the overall activities of an institution. Perhaps some more direct contact between accrediting agencies and the study sites was needed.

The writer followed up the January discussion in a meeting in Madrid in September, 197C. At that time the Conference Board was involved in more clearly defining the meaning of membership, in revising questionnaires and in establishing procedures for evaluating study programs. Some twenty programs had identified themselves with the Conference Board through the payment of membership dues, and many of them had completed the preliminary questionnaires on program developed by the Executive Committee of the Board. Subsequently, a new questionnaire has been developed, and the Conference Board is proceeding with a review of the responses to the new form.

That some form of evaluation of study abroad programs be undertaken by regional accrediting agencies seems to be basic to the efforts of the Conference Board and of the Council on International Educational

Exchange. The concern is highlighted by the more recent discussions held among the University of California overseas directors during a meeting on Corsica in January, 1971. The concerns are legitimate. There are problems in the proliferation of American study programs abroad, problems that will have to be dealt with in some specific way in the near future.

Why have not the regional accrediting agencies been more directly involved in some evaluation of overseas study programs as such? Only three of the seven higher commissions have had experience in evaluating programs overseas--if one includes Latin America in the category of "overseas." The Southern Association has evaluated collegiate programs in Mexico. The Middle States Association is currently involved in the evaluation of a candidate institution in Paris, the American School in Paris. The North Central Association gave preliminary status to a program jointly operated by one of its member institutions and an institute in Paris. The only additional overseas evaluations have been made by the Secondary Commission of the North Central Association and the Secondary Commission of the Southern Association. The Commission on Secondary Schools of the North Central Association has extensive experience in evaluating dependent schools in Europe and elsewhere. These are schools established by the Armed Services of the United States for the education of dependents of American personnel stationed overseas. The Secondary Commission of the Southern Association has evaluated American schools in Latin America.

One of the basic issues for the regional accrediting agencies is that of priorities. Although the number of students participating in overseas study has increased significantly in recent years, the number

in relation to the total enrollment in American higher educational institutions is still quite small. A report of the Institute of International Education in late 1966 notes:

> The great majority of the liberal arts colleges in the United States now organize some sort of study-travel program of their own, or approve the participation of their students in some other programs. Until 1950, only a half dozen junior year abroad programs existed. The number rose to 22 in 1956. Two years ago the first edition of this book reported 103 college-sponsored programs conducted during the academic year 1962-63. In this new edition, we list 208, an increase of about 100 percent in three years. Summer programs for resident study abroad have increased from 63 in 1962 to 97 in 1965. Scores of institutions have indicated that they are seriously considering the inauguration of a program abroad in the next year or two.[34]

As already noted, recent editions of the Institute of International Education's Open Doors: Report on International Exchange, record some 25,000 United States students enrolled in over 550 institutions. In 1957 the newly established Institute of Research and Overseas Programs of Michigan State University undertook a study of international programs of American universities.[35] In 1966 the Institute of Advanced Projects of the East-West Center repeated a study covering the same general issues.[36] The data covering 1964-65 in comparison with the data from the earlier study show an increase from 382 different programs to 1,314 different programs and increases from 184 institutions involved in international programs to 369 institutions. Other studies report

---

[34]Institute of International Education, Undergraduate Study Abroad: U.S. College-Sponsored Programs, New York: Institute of International Education, 1966, p. 7.

[35]Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, The International Programs of American Universities, East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, 1958.

[36]Institute of Advanced Projects of the East-West Center, International Programs of American Universities: An Inventory and Analysis, East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, 1966.

the same order of growth. Yet, the fall enrollment in American higher institutions for 1970 was in the vicinity of 8.8 million students, a figure which includes all students pursuing some kind of degree-credit program, part-time and full-time. Even though more than 25,000 American students were involved in overseas study as reported by the Institute of International Education, the 25,000 represent a small portion of the 8.8 million. The regional agencies, facing many demands at this time, have questioned whether the number of students in study abroad is large enough to cause a special concern.

Viewed in terms of relative numbers involved special evaluation of overseas study programs probably ought not to high in the priorities of regional accrediting agencies. And, for any given American institution, with some few exceptions, overseas study probably represents a very small portion of its total program. Yet, the pressures of American study programs in a single overseas location presents a different dimension. Consider, for example, Madrid. While the following summary is based upon limited information made available to the writer during a visit to Madrid in September, 1970, it does indicate something of the dimensions of the situation. There are well over 1,000 American students concentrated in Madrid on a year-round basis. Data provided by the Institute of International Education show over 900 enrolled at the University of Madrid alone.[37] With summer programs, short-terms, study tours, and other variations, the total American student population in Madrid could be over 2,000. There seem to be five more or less distinct types. They may be roughly categorized as follcws:

---

[37]Cf. Institute of International Education, Open Doors, 1970: Report on International Exchange, N.Y.: Institute of International Education, 1970.

1) A group of institutions with offices in the Facultad de Filosofia y Letras of the University of Madrid. These institutions include the Associated Colleges of Mid-Florida, Vanderbilt, City University of New York, Indiana and Purdue, University of California and the California State Colleges, among others, and for the most part maintain offices in the building of the Facultad. Joining together, they are able to arrange for special classes for their institutions. The number of special classes provided by the University of Madrid is based upon the total number of students enrolled in the several programs. In effect, these institutions constitute a consortium of a type. As a group they are able to arrange for a broader program than they could achieve individually.

2) Another group of institutions maintains offices at the International Institute for Girls in Spain, Miguel Angel 8. This includes Temple Buell, Middlebury, Kalamazoo, Lake Forest College, and others. Apparently these colleges have jointly established some classes at the University, others outside of the University and some individually for their own students.

3) Another group of institutions seems to operate more or less independently. Central College in Iowa has made arrangements with officials at the University of Madrid independent of the colleges with offices in the Facultad. Mariast College makes arrangements for its own classes. A number of other institutions operate in much the same way.

4) Some colleges, notably as of this year New York University, work directly with the Instituto de Cultura Hispanica and have offices in the Instituto. New York University is contracting for additional

space in the Instituto to house not only offices but lecture rooms.

5) There exist a number of summer study tour groups, each of which makes its own arrangements for housing and lectures.

6) Some few programs are being developed by commercial agencies and travel bureaus.

The variety of arrangements made, and the above is only a rough categorization, suggests the complexity of the problem of assessing the quality of programs in Madrid alone. But even as it suggests the complexity of the problem, it also shows the necessity for some kind of overall review.

In the table below are listed academic year programs according to the United States accrediting regions. Enrollment counts are given as reported to the Institute of Hispanic Culture in Madrid and for the academic year 1970-71.

The listing also shows the type of affiliation the program holds. The letter (U) in parenthesis indicates that the college appears to be a member of the group that has negotiated a program with the Facultad de Filosofia y Letras. The letters (CON) refers to the group with offices at Miguel Angel and presumably jointly developing programs. The other designation is independent (IND).

REGIONAL ACCREDITING AGENCY	INSTITUTION	LOCATION	ENROLLMENT 1970-71
Southern Association	Associated Colleges of Mid-Florida	Madrid (U)	22
	Tulane-Newcomb	Madrid (U)	4
	Mary Baldwin	Madrid (CON)	21
	Vanderbilt	Madrid (U)	25
	Southern Methodist University	Madrid (IND)	24
	Furman	Madrid (U)	15
			111

REGIONAL ACCREDITING AGENCY	INSTITUTION	LOCATION	ENROLLMENT 1970-71
Middle States Association	Elmira College	Madrid (U)	2
	Georgetown University	Madrid (U)	60
	New York University	Madrid (U-Sep)	165
	Mariast College	Madrid (U)	10
	St. Lawrence University	Madrid (IND)	17
	Maryland University	Madrid (IND)	300*
	State University of New York, Potsdam	Madrid (U)	31
	State University of New York, Albany	Madrid (IND)	20
	State University of New York, Cortland	Salamanca (U)	30
	City Univ. of N.Y.	Seville (U)	12
	City Univ. of N.Y.	Grenada (U)	11
			658
New England Association	Vassar-Wesleyan	Madrid (CON)	28
	Middlebury College	Madrid (CON)	80
	Smith College	Madrid (CON)	12
	Univ. of New Hampshire	Navarre (U)	16
	Dartmouth	Salamanca (U)	9
			145
North Central Association	Indiana University (Graduate)	Madrid (U)	8
	Indiana-Purdue-Wisconsin	Madrid (U)	29
	Marquette Univ.	Madrid (U)	56
	Central College (Iowa)	Madrid (U)	30
	St. Louis Univ.	Madrid (IND)	40
	Kalamazoo College	Madrid (CON)	20
	Temple Buell	Madrid (CON)	9
	Lake Forest College	Madrid (CON)	15
	Bowling-Green	Madrid (IND)	32
	Lawrence University (Wisconsin)	Madrid (U)	11
	Knox College	Barcelona (U)	20
	Ohio Wesleyan-Otterbein	Segovia (IND)	18
	Institute of European Studies	Madrid (U)	45
			333
Western Association	California State Colleges	Madrid (U)	37
	California State Colleges	Grenada (U)	20

REGIONAL ACCREDITING AGENCY	INSTITUTION	LOCATION	ENROLLMENT 1970-71
	Univ. of California Center	Madrid (U)	72
	Stanford University	Grenada (U)	14
			143
Northwest Association	Brigham Young University	Madrid (IND)	56
	University of Portland	Navarre (U)	16
			72

*University of Maryland offers classes at the Torrejon Air Base and at the American Embassy. The University grants a B.A. in General Studies, a Master's degree in Education and Management, an Associate in Arts certificate in Data Processing.

There are in addition programs such as the Academic Year Abroad (29 students) with offices at Miguel Angel, the Academic Year in Europe at the University of Salamanca (12 students) and the Junior Year in Spain at the University of Valencia (80 students). There are well over 1,000 American students in Madrid alone on a year-round basis, perhaps a thousand more in summer programs, short terms, study tours, and other variations.

The development in Madrid could in part be duplicated in other localities such as Paris, London, and around certain of the German universities. As far as the overseas site is concerned, American study abroad does represent a sizeable population. And while the number of students from any one American institution may be limited, when the entire group is considered, the impact on the overseas site can be considerable. In any one location there is a hodge-podge of programs. The development is likely to continue, but it may become more difficult for American institutions either to establish new programs or to relate

themselves in intelligent ways to existing programs. Some effort should be made to assess the various developments and provide authoritative information on what is happening.

The concerns that brought the Regional Conference Board into existence are legitimate. There do seem to be poorly organized and maintained programs that could call into question the effectiveness of the better organized and staffed programs. And while regional accrediting agencies may not be prepared (or able) to place evaluation of study abroad high on the list of priorities at this time, some effort should be launched at least in an exploratory way to define more clearly what the problems are now and what they may become in the future. As a specific proposal, why not undertake a pilot evaluation using Madrid as a case study? Such a pilot evaluation would include the following:

1. Such an evaluation should be inter-regional, i.e. it should be a cooperative venture of several regional associations, rather than the effort of individual regional associations. While well over 1,000 students are involved in Madrid alone, with the exception of three or four institutions, the total number of students from any one institution hardly merits a site evaluation by a single regional agency. However, the six regions cooperating in a single pilot evaluation can provide feedback for the institutions in their own regions.
2. Any site evaluation undertaken should not be viewed as a second accreditation. The programs are maintained by institutions already regionally accredited. What the site evaluation should do is to provide some insight into such matters as: the special problems of overseas programs, the

quality of programs now underway, and some ideas about situations to be avoided. Such information can then be referred to the home institutions, and at the time of the periodic review of any institution in any one of the six accrediting regions, the overseas program information should be part of the review visit itself. Several recommendations might develop out of the site visit: (a) the program may be viewed as a strong part of the home institution's educational program, it should be continued; (b) some questions may be raised about the management of the program, and these questions can be relayed to the home institution; (c) enough issues might be raised to encourage the home institution to drop the program, to change it significantly, or even to call into question . the way in which planning efforts of the home institution have been undertaken.

3. However the evaluation is undertaken, the study abroad programs should not be treated separately or independently of the regular contacts the regional associations have with their member institutions.
4. Develop a small team representing several of the regions. Include on this team some members from the field of Spanish literature and language. The team should not, however, be dominated by professionals in the field but should represent persons with general evaluation competencies.
5. Ask each of the five or six programs agreeing to participate in a pilot study to undertake a form of self-study and prepare

a written report for the Federation. This self-study might follow somewhat the outline of the questions raised by the Conference Board and could be related to the criteria on undergraduate study programs abroad developed by the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education in April, 1967. There should be a 10-15 page document that provides specific information regarding the purpose of the program, a description of the administrative relationships, a roster of personnel involved, some statement regarding self evaluation, some insight into the way in which the home institution maintains a connection with the study program.

6. Plan to have the team spend approximately one week in Madrid. One or two members might make one-day trips to Seville and/or Barcelona. The team would undertake the general evaluation of the administrative arrangements, assess the student response, attempt to determine the special problems facing overseas programs such as those in Madrid and Spain. As already suggested, the team should have members competent in Spanish language and literature. But the team should essentially be generalists concerned with overall assessment of the program.

Such an approach could have a decided impact not only on the programs in Madrid, but on American study abroad generally. It will give them some understanding of the concerns of the regional accrediting agencies and the home institutions. It seems almost inevitable that some of the now haphazard arrangements will be reexamined and redeveloped

in a more systematic way. The net result of the pilot evaluation, whether any subsequent visits are scheduled, should be a better informed group of people both in the home institutions and the regional offices and in the overseas programs in Madrid and the rest of Spain.

In the preceding articles I have attempted to deal in the micro and macro aspects of the evaluation of overseas study programs. The report on Goshen College indicates how an individual institution is developing an ongoing evaluation program. Its approach should alert and sensitize institutions involved in overseas evaluation as to what an individual institution can do. The report on the development of the Regional Conference Board in Spain indicates the broader concerns and should alert and sensitize institutions on a regional and national basis. Both approaches are needed in order to develop and maintain quality in overseas study, a small but increasingly important component of American higher education.